

the 3 percent a year annuity reduction prior to age 65. The same argument is true for many classroom teachers. Both building administration and classroom teaching are high profile occupation and the years of stress can take their toll." I think the concept is a valid one. It is highly defensible. I strongly urge that this body defeat the kill motion and eventually pass the bill on today. Thank you very much.

**SPEAKER BARRETT:** Thank you. Additional discussion on the IFP motion, the member from the 26th District, Senator Wesely, Senator Bernard-Stevens on deck.

**SENATOR WESELY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. I co-sponsored the kill motion with Senator Johnson and I do so from a long history that Senator Johnson and I both have in this issue. We have been involved in it for ten years now, the Legislature, and for ten years we have heard the same arguments that you have just heard expressed, that early retirement, in fact, saves money and is the better policy choice. We have argued on the other side and now, at this point, it looks as though we will be unsuccessful once again, because I understand there are 40 some people that feel strongly enough about this bill they have made some commitment in support of it. But the argument needs to be made and the issue needs to be readdressed, and I think we need to keep pointing out that, in fact, if the concept of early retirement is so wonderful, so cost beneficial, then why do we not apply it to all the other groups. If you look at one of the handouts I have, you will see that the only exception we have made to provide for early retirement without an actuarial reduction are the school employees, both generally and in Omaha, and then for fire fighters and police. Now fire fighters and police, obviously, you can't have those individuals working too long with the physical demands of the job. We have provided for early retirement in those cases, but we haven't for other types of employees, similar perhaps to school employees. I am talking about state employees. I am talking about county employees. I am talking about judges, University of Nebraska faculty, state college faculty. We have taken a position that these individuals do not have early retirement without an actuarial reduction. That is to say they don't have subsidized early retirement. Now, what difference is it to be a teacher and be burned out or a judge to be burned out? Why should we provide the benefit to the teacher but not the judge? Do we not want judges that are alive and alert and full of energy and making decisions of great importance? How can we justify, and I